arXiv:1208.1341v1 [math.LO] 7 Aug 2012

VALUED DIFFERENCE FIELDS AND NTP_2

ARTEM CHERNIKOV AND MARTIN HILS

Abstract. We show that the theory of the non-standard Frobenius automorphism, acting on an algebraically closed valued field of equal characteristic 0, is NTP_2. More generally, we prove that a contractive σ-henselian valued difference field of characteristic 0 is NTP_2, provided both the residue difference field and the value group (as an ordered difference group) are NTP_2. In addition, we demonstrate an analogous result for a possible refinement of NTP_2 called resilience.

1. Introduction

Model theory has proven to be a fruitful framework to study fields with extra structure. Central examples include valued fields (e.g. the work of Haskell, Hrushovski and Macpherson on the theory of algebraically closed valued fields, ACVF, see [HHM08]) and difference fields (starting with the work of Chatzidakis and Hrushovski on the theory of algebraically closed fields with a *generic* automorphism, ACFA, see [CH99]). In this paper, we are considering a combination of these, namely valued difference fields, i.e. valued fields with a distinguished automorphism (preserving the valuation ring).

Every non-principal ultrapoduct of structures of the form $(\mathbb{F}_p^a, Frob_p)$ is a model of ACFA_0, i.e. the non-standard Frobenius is a generic automorphism. This is a deep result of Hrushovski [Hru04] which required a twisted version of the Lang-Weil estimates.

One may consider the non-standard Frobenius acting on an algebraically closed *valued* field, i.e. the limit theory of the Frobenius automorphism acting on an algebraically closed valued field of characteristic p (where p tends to infinity). Hrushovski [Hru02] gives a natural axiomatisation of this limit theory in the language of valued difference fields (denoted by VFA_0 in the sequel). Durhan [Azg10] obtains an alternative axiomatisation, as well as an Ax-Kochen-Ershov principle for a certain class of valued difference fields.

The theory VFA_0 is interesting from an algebraic point of view. The residue field together with the induced automorphism $\overline{\sigma}$ is a model of ACFA_0, by the aforementioned result of Hrushovski. The induced automorphism σ_Γ on the value

---

Date: August 8, 2012.

Key words and phrases. Model theory, valued difference field, non-standard Frobenius, NTP2

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary: 03C45; Secondary: 03C60, 12L12.

The first author was supported by the Marie Curie Initial Training Network in Mathematical Logic - MALOA - From MAthematical LOgic to Applications, PITN-GA-2009-238381.

The second author was partially funded by the Agence Nationale de Recherche [MODIG, Projet ANR-09-BLAN-0047].

A substantial part of the research was carried out during the program 'Model Theory and Applications' at the Max Planck Institut für Mathematik in Bonn. The second author would like to thank for the hospitality and the support of the MPIM.

group Γ is *ω-increasing* (i.e. $\sigma_\Gamma(\gamma) > n\gamma$ for all $\gamma > 0$ and $n \geq 1$; valued difference fields satisfying this property will be called *contractive*). Thus, Γ gets the structure of a divisible torsion free ordered $\mathbb{Z}[\sigma]$-module (i.e. an ordered vector space over $\mathbb{Q}(\sigma)$, where $\sigma >> 1$ is an indeterminate). It is sufficient to add a *σ-Hensel property* (see Definition 2.5) to obtain an axiomatisation of VFA_0.

Moreover, valued difference fields enter the study of (non-valued) difference fields by way of *transformal specialisations* (see [Hru04]). A better understanding of valued difference fields will most probably shed new light on Hrushovski's proof of the non-standard Frobenius result.

Work of Shelah on the model theoretic classification program [She90] had demonstrated the importance of understanding which combinatorial configurations a theory can encode. In the case of stable theories (i.e. theories that cannot encode linear order) he had developed a beautiful and fruitful theory of analysing types and models. Further work of Poizat, Hrushovski and other researchers, generalising the ideas of Zilber in the finite rank case, culminated in the creation of *geometric stability theory* establishing deep connections between the geometry of forking independence and properties of algebraic structures (groups and fields) definable in the theory. Later on it became clear that stability-theoretic methods can be generalised to larger contexts, and in the last twenty years there had been two main directions: simple theories [Wag00] and, more recently, NIP theories [Adl08]. A characteristic property of these developments is that the motivation is coming both from purely model theoretic considerations and from the study of particular important algebraic structures: ACFA as a prototypical example of a simple unstable theory, and ACVF as a typical example of an (unstable) NIP theory. These lines of research had found numerous applications [Hru01, HK06, HL11].

Observe that the theory VFA_0 is neither *simple* (due to the total order in the value group) nor NIP (due to the independence property which holds in the residue field).

It turns out that in the 80's Shelah had defined another class — NTP_2 theories, or theories without the tree property of the second kind [She80]. This class generalises both simple and NIP theories, and contains new examples (any ultraproduct of p-adics is NTP_2 [Che12]). Recently it had attracted attention, largely motivated by Pillay's question on equality of forking and dividing over models in NIP, and a good theory of forking for NTP_2 theories had been developed [CK12, Che12, BYC12].

In this paper, we show that VFA_0 is NTP_2. This provides a new and interesting algebraic example of an NTP_2 theory. More generally, we show that in the context of contractive σ-henselian valued difference fields of characteristic 0 (where an Ax-Kochen-Ershov principle holds by [Azg10]), the theory of the valued difference field is NTP_2, provided both the theory of the value group (with the induced automorphism) and the theory of the residue field (with the induced automorphism) are NTP_2. Moreover, we demonstrate preservation of a (possibly) finer property called *resilience*. Similar transfer results hold in the context of valued fields, where they are derived from the usual Ax-Kochen-Ershov principle: F. Delon [Del81] showed this for NIP, S. Shelah [She09] for strongly dependent (a strengthening of NIP) and the first author [Che12] for NTP_2 (and finiteness of burden). Our method of proof combines a new result on extending indiscernible arrays by parameters coming from NTP_2 sorts with a refinement of Durhan's back-and-forth system used to eliminate field quantifiers, along with the residual analysability of σ-algebraic extensions. In this way, we reduce the statement to a combinatorial condition on intersections of type-definable balls which is easy to check directly.

An overview of the paper. In Section 2, we recall the basic model-theoretic results on contractive valued difference fields. Section 3 contains general results on manipulating indiscernible arrays in NTP$_2$ theories. The main theorem of the paper is then proved in Section 4. In Section 5 we discuss resilience and prove an analogue of the main theorem with respect to it. We end with a list of open problems.

2. Preliminaries on valued difference fields

In this section, we present the necessary material on valued difference fields which we will need for our purposes. Most of it may be found in [Azg10], but we will also need the context from [Azg07], where an angular component is used instead of a cross-section. See also [Pal10, Gia11], and the unpublished notes [Hru02] of Hrushovski, where most of the ideas already appear.

2.1. **Ordered difference groups.**

An *ordered difference group* is a structure of the form $\langle \Gamma, 0, +, -, <, \sigma\rangle$, where $\langle \Gamma, 0, +, -, <\rangle$ is an ordered abelian group and σ is an automorphism of $\langle \Gamma, 0, +, -, <\rangle$. The automorphism σ is called *ω-increasing* if $\sigma(\gamma) > n\gamma$ for all $\gamma \in \Gamma_{>0}$ and all natural numbers n. We treat ordered difference groups as first order structures in the language $\mathcal{L}_{ODG} = \{0, +, -, <, \sigma\}$; the class of ω-increasing ordered difference groups may be axiomatised, and we denote it by IncODG.

Any $\langle \Gamma, +, <, \sigma\rangle \models$ IncODG is an ordered (and so in particular torsion free) $\mathbb{Z}[\sigma]$-module, where $\mathbb{Z}[\sigma]$ is the ordered ring of polynomials in the indeterminate σ with $\sigma >> 1$. For $p = p(\sigma) = \sum z_i \sigma^i \in \mathbb{Z}[\sigma]$, one puts $p \cdot \gamma := \sum z_i \sigma^i(\gamma)$. Conversely, any ordered $\mathbb{Z}[\sigma, \sigma^{-1}]$-module gives rise to a model of IncODG. When divisible, such modules correspond to ordered vector spaces over the (ordered) fraction field $\mathbb{Q}(\sigma)$ of $\mathbb{Z}[\sigma]$. The theory of non-trivial divisible ordered $\mathbb{Z}[\sigma]$-modules will be denoted by IncDODG.

The following fact is easy (see e.g. [Pal10]).

Fact 2.1. *The theory* IncDODG *is the model-completion of* IncODG*. In particular,* IncDODG *eliminates quantifiers and is o-minimal.* □

For $\gamma \in \Gamma \models$ IncODG and $\zeta = (z_0, \ldots, z_n) \in \mathbb{Z}^{n+1}$, we will sometimes denote $\sum_{i=0}^{n} z_i \sigma^i(\gamma)$ by $\sigma^{\zeta}(\gamma)$.

2.2. **σ-henselianity in contractive valued difference fields.**

Notation and conventions.

By a *difference field* we will always mean a field K together with a distinguished automorphism σ, i.e. what is sometimes called an *inversive* difference field.

If K is a difference field, one may form the ring of difference polynomials $K[X]_\sigma := K[X, \sigma(X), \sigma^2(X), \ldots]$.

For $g(X) \in K[X]_\sigma$ non-constant, define order(g) to be the minimal n such that g may be written as $g(X) = G(X, \sigma(X), \sigma^2(X), \ldots, \sigma^n(X))$, for some polynomial $G \in K[X_0, \ldots, X_n]$. If order$(g) = n$, we put

$$\text{complexity}(g) := (n, \deg_{X_n}(G), \deg(G)) \in \mathbb{N}^3,$$

where $\deg(G)$ is the total degree of G. We say that g has *smaller complexity* than h if $\text{complexity}(g) <_{lex} \text{complexity}(h)$.

The Taylor expansion in several variables, $G(\overline{a}+\overline{X}) = \sum_{\mu} G_{\mu}(\overline{a})\overline{X}^{\mu}$, gives rise to the Taylor expansion of difference polynomials (in one variable)

$$g(a+X) = \sum_{\mu} g_{\mu}(a)X^{\mu},$$

where $g_{\mu}(X) = G_{\mu}(X, \sigma(X), \ldots, \sigma^{n}(X))$ for every multiindex $\mu = (\mu_0, \ldots, \mu_n)$. Here, $X^{\mu} := \prod_{i=0}^{n}(\sigma^{i}(X))^{\mu_i}$.

If $K \subseteq L$ is an extension of difference fields and a is a tuple from L, then $K\langle a\rangle$ denotes the difference field generated by a over K; as a field, it is given by $K(\sigma^{z}(a),\, z \in \mathbb{Z})$. An element $a \in L$ is called *σ-algebraic* over K if $g(a) = 0$ for some non-constant $g(X) \in K[X]_{\sigma}$; else, it is called *σ-transcendent* over K. In the first case, if g is of minimal complexity, it is said to be a *minimal σ-polynomial* of a over K.

Recall that a *valued field* is given by a surjective map $\text{val} : K \to \Gamma_{\infty}$, where K is a field and $\Gamma_{\infty} = \Gamma \cup \{\infty\}$, with Γ an ordered abelian group and ∞ a distinct element satisfying

- $\text{val}(x) = \infty \iff x = 0$;
- $\text{val}(xy) = \text{val}(x) + \text{val}(y)$ for all $x, y \in K$;
- $\text{val}(x+y) \geq \max\{\text{val}(x), \text{val}(y)\}$ for all $x, y \in K$.

Here, the order is extended to a total order on Γ_{∞} making ∞ the maximal element, and the addition is exended so that ∞ becomes an absorbing element.

We will usually not distinguish between Γ and Γ_{∞} and suppress ∞ in our paper. This abuse of notation is entirely harmless.

The *valuation ring* is given by $\mathcal{O} = \{x \in K \mid \text{val}(x) \geq 0\}$. It is a local ring, with maximal ideal $\mathfrak{m} = \{x \in K \mid \text{val}(x) > 0\}$. The *residue map* is given by $\text{res} : \mathcal{O} \to \mathcal{O}/\mathfrak{m} =: k$, and k is called the *residue field* of K. Sometimes, we will use $\overline{a}$ instead of $\text{res}(a)$. We often write Γ_K or k_K to stress that we deal with the value group or residue field of the valued field K.

An extension $K \subseteq L$ gives rise to extensions $k_K \subseteq k_L$ and $\Gamma_K \subseteq \Gamma_L$. The following inequality for the transcendental invariants is easy but fundamental.

Fact 2.2. *Let L/K be an extension of valued fields. Then*

$$\text{td}(L/K) \geq \text{td}(k_L/k_K) + \text{rk}_{\mathbb{Q}}(\Gamma_L/\Gamma_K).$$

Here, for A an abelian group, $\text{rk}_{\mathbb{Q}}(A)$ denotes the *rational rank* of A, i.e. the dimension of $A \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{Q}$ as a $\mathbb{Q}$-vector space.

A *valued difference field* is a valued field K together with a distinguished automorphism σ satisfying $\sigma(\mathcal{O}) = \mathcal{O}$. Note that σ induces an automorphism $\overline{\sigma}$ of the residue field, making it a difference field. Similarly, σ induces an automorphism σ_{Γ} of the value group, making it an ordered difference group. Most of the time, we will drop the subscript and use σ for the automorphism on the value groups as well. This should not lead to confusions.

Definition 2.3. A valued difference field $\mathcal{K} = (K, \Gamma_K, k_K, \sigma)$ is called *contractive* if its value group Γ_K is an ω-increasing ordered difference group.

Let $\mathcal{K} = (K, \Gamma_K, k_K, \sigma)$ be a contractive valued difference field, with *fixed field* $F := \mathrm{Fix}(\sigma) := \{a \in K \mid \sigma(a) = a\}$. Then res $\upharpoonright_F$ is injective. In particular, $\mathrm{char}(K) = \mathrm{char}(k_K)$. (In case $\mathcal{K}$ is σ-henselian in the sense of the definition below, res induces an isomorphism between F and $\mathrm{Fix}(\overline{\sigma})$.) More generally, we have the following, which is easily obtained from Fact 2.2.

Fact 2.4. *Let $L \supseteq K$ be an extension of contractive valued difference fields, and let $a \in L$. Suppose that $p \cdot \mathrm{val}(a) \notin \Gamma_K$ for any $0 \neq p \in \mathbb{Z}[\sigma]$. Then a is σ-transcendent over K.* □

Definition 2.5 ([Azg10, Definition 4.5])**.**

- Let K be contractive, $g(X) \in K[X]_\sigma$, $\mathrm{order}(g) \leq n$, let $\mu, \nu, \rho \in \mathbb{N}^{n+1}$ and $a \in K$.

  We say that (g, a) is in *σ-Hensel configuration* if $g \notin K$ and if there exists μ with $|\mu| = 1$ and $\gamma \in \Gamma_K$ such that the following holds:
  (i) $\mathrm{val}(g(a)) = \mathrm{val}(g_\mu(a)) + \sigma^\mu(\gamma) \leq \mathrm{val}(g_\nu(a)) + \sigma^\nu(\gamma)$ for all ν with $|\nu| = 1$;
  (ii) $\mathrm{val}(g_\nu(a)) + \sigma^\nu(\gamma) < \mathrm{val}(g_{\nu+\rho}(a)) + \sigma^{\nu+\rho}(\gamma)$ for all $\nu, \rho \neq 0$ with $g_\nu \neq 0$.

  Put $\gamma(g, a) :=$ the γ from above (this is uniquely determined).
- A contractive valued difference field K is called *σ-henselian* if for every (g, a) in σ-Hensel configuration there exists $b \in K$ with $\mathrm{val}(b - a) = \gamma(g, a)$ and $g(b) = 0$.

Remark 2.6.

1. Let (K, k, Γ, σ) be contractive and σ-henselian. Then $(k, \bar{\sigma})$ is *linearly difference closed*, i.e. for all $\alpha_0, \ldots, \alpha_n \in k$ not all 0, the equation $1 + \alpha_0 X + \alpha_1 \sigma(X) + \cdots + \alpha_n \sigma^n(X)$ has a solution in $(k, \bar{\sigma})$.
2. Conversely, let (Γ, σ) be an ω-increasing ordered difference group and $(k, \bar{\sigma})$ a linearly closed difference field of characteristic 0. Then, by [Azg10, Corollary 5.6], the Hahn field $K := k((\Gamma))$, a valued field which is naturally equipped with an automorphism σ, namely $\sigma(\sum_\gamma a_\gamma t^\gamma) := \sum_\gamma \overline{\sigma}(a_\gamma) t^{\sigma(\gamma)}$, is a contractive σ-henselian valued difference field.

For completeness, let us mention another consequence of the results in [Azg10]. (We will not use of it in our paper.)

Remark 2.7. A σ-henselian contractive valued difference field is henselian (as a valued field).

For $q = p^n$ a prime power, consider $\mathcal{K}_q = (K_q, \Gamma, k, \varphi_q)$, where $(K_q, \Gamma, k) \models \mathrm{ACVF}_{p,p}$ and φ_q is the Frobenius automorphism $x \mapsto x^q$.

The following follows in a straight forward way from [Azg10, Section 8] (see [Gia11, Proof of Thm 4.3.24] for a proof).

Fact 2.8. *For every non-principal ultrafilter $\mathcal{U}$ on the set Q of prime powers, $\prod_\mathcal{U} K_q$ is σ-henselian, i.e. the non-standard Frobenius automorphism is σ-henselian.*

2.3. **AKE principle and** VFA$_0$.

An ac-*valued difference field* is a valued difference field $\mathcal{K} = (K, \Gamma, k, \sigma)$ together with an *angular component map* ac : $K \to k$ satisfying the following three properties:

- $\mathrm{ac}(x) = 0$ iff $x = 0$;
- ac $\upharpoonright_{K^\times}: K^\times \to k^\times$ is a group homomorphism commuting with σ;
- for all $x \in K$ with $\mathrm{val}(x) = 0$, one has $\mathrm{ac}(x) = \mathrm{res}(x)$.

We will treat valued difference fields in the three-sorted language $\mathcal{L}_{\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{\Gamma}, \sigma}$, consisting of

- the language of difference rings $\mathcal{L}_{\mathbf{K}} = \{0, 1, +, -, \times, \sigma\}$ on the valued field sort denoted by $\mathbf{K}$;
- (a copy of) the language of difference rings $\mathcal{L}_{\mathbf{k}} = \{0, 1, +, -, \times, \overline{\sigma}\}$ on the residue field sort denoted by $\mathbf{k}$;
- the language of ordered difference groups (with an additional infinite element) $\{0, +, -, <, \infty, \sigma_\Gamma\}$ on the value group sort denoted by $\mathbf{\Gamma}$, and
- the functions val : $\mathbf{K} \to \mathbf{\Gamma}$ and res : $\mathbf{K} \to \mathbf{k}$ between the sorts. (When considering a valued field as an $\mathcal{L}_{\mathbf{k},\mathbf{\Gamma},\sigma}$-structure, we may make the function res total by sending elements of negative valuation to $0 \in \mathbf{k}$.)

Denote by T_0 the theory of σ-henselian contractive valued difference fields of equal characteristic 0 (in the language $\mathcal{L}_{\mathbf{k},\mathbf{\Gamma},\sigma}$), and by T_0^{ac} that of σ-henselian contractive ac-valued difference fields (in the language $\mathcal{L}_{\mathbf{k},\mathbf{\Gamma},\sigma} \cup \{\mathrm{ac}\}$).

Fact 2.9 (Durhan). *(1) The theory T_0^{ac} eliminates quantifiers from the field sort $\mathbf{K}$.*

(2) In any model $\mathcal{K} = (K, \Gamma_K, k_K) \models T_0^{\mathrm{ac}}$, $k_K = \mathbf{k}(\mathcal{K})$ is stably embedded, and the induced structure is that of a difference field. Similarly, $\Gamma_K = \mathbf{\Gamma}(\mathcal{K})$ is stably embedded and is a pure ordered $\mathbb{Z}[\sigma]$-module. Moreover, $\mathbf{k}$ and $\mathbf{\Gamma}$ are orthogonal, i.e. every definable subset of $\mathbf{k}^m \times \mathbf{\Gamma}^n$ is a finite union of rectangles.

(3) Let $\mathcal{K} = (K, \Gamma_K, k_K)$ and $\mathcal{L} = (L, \Gamma_L, k_L)$ be models of T_0.
  - *(a) $\mathcal{K} \equiv \mathcal{L}$ if and only if $k_K \equiv k_L$ (as difference fields) and $\Gamma_K \equiv \Gamma_L$ (as ordered difference groups).*
  - *(b) Suppose $\mathcal{K} \subseteq \mathcal{L}$. Then $\mathcal{K} \preccurlyeq \mathcal{L}$ if and only if $k_K \preccurlyeq k_L$ and $\Gamma_K \preccurlyeq \Gamma_L$.*

Proof. The results follow easily from [Azg07, Thm 4.4.6], but they are not stated there exactly in this form. □

If A is a substructure of $\mathcal{K} = (K, \Gamma_K, k_K)$, we write $\mathbf{K}(A)$ for the elements of A which are in sort $\mathbf{K}$. Similarly, we have $\mathbf{\Gamma}(A) \subseteq \Gamma_K$ and $\mathbf{k}(A) \subseteq k_K$. Note that in general val($\mathbf{K}(A)$) is a proper subset of $\mathbf{\Gamma}(A)$, and similarly for res and ac.

Let IncVFA_0 be the theory of structures $\mathcal{K} = (K, k, \Gamma)$ (in the language $\mathcal{L}_{\mathbf{k},\mathbf{\Gamma},\sigma} \cup \{\mathrm{ac}\}$), (K, k_K, Γ_K) is a contractive valued difference field of characteristic 0, $(k, \overline{\sigma})$ is a difference field containing k_K, and $(\Gamma, \sigma_\Gamma) \models \mathrm{IncODG}$ contains Γ_K as a difference subgroup. (I.e. we do not require that the maps res and val are surjective.)

Let VFA_0 be the theory T_0^{ac}, together with axioms expressing that $(\mathbf{k}, \overline{\sigma}) \models \mathrm{ACFA}_0$ and that $(\mathbf{\Gamma}, \sigma) \models \mathrm{IncDODG}$.

Fact 2.10. VFA_0 *is the model-companion of* IncVFA_0*, in the language of* ac*-valued difference fields. The same result holds if both* VFA_0 *and* IncVFA_0 *are restricted to the language of valued difference fields.*

Proof. For ac-valued difference fields, the result follows from [Azg07]. If $M \subseteq N$ are $\aleph_1$-saturated models of the reduct of VFA_0 to the language of valued difference fields (without ac), then the pair may be expanded to an elementary pair of ac-valued difference fields. Indeed, this follows from [Pal10, Thm 11.6 and the discussion before]. Model-completeness of VFA_0 in the language without ac follows. (See also [Gia11, Thm 4.3.20].) □

With a slightly different notion of σ-henselianity, Fact 2.10 had been independently obtained by Hrushovski in [Hru02], where the following consequence is also mentioned. (See also [Gia11, Thm 4.3.24].)

Fact 2.11 (Hrushovski)**.** *Let φ be a sentence in the language of* ac*-valued difference fields. The following are equivalent:*

1. $\mathrm{VFA}_0 \vdash \varphi$*;*
2. $\mathcal{K}_q \models \varphi$ *for all large enough prime powers* q*;*
3. $\mathcal{K}_p \models \varphi$ *for all large enough primes* p*.*

Proof. Every instance of the σ-Hensel scheme holds in $\mathcal{K}_q$ for $q >> 0$, by Fact 2.8. Moreover, it is easy to see that every axiom of ordered $\mathbb{Q}(\sigma)$-vector spaces holds in $(\Gamma_{K_q}, \gamma \mapsto q\gamma)$ for $q >> 0$. By Fact 2.9, it is thus enough to show that the limit theories of the residue difference fields coincide with ACFA_0 in both cases. This is true, by a very deep result of Hrushovski [Hru04]. □

Examples 2.12.
1. Let $\mathcal{U}$ be a non-prinicpal ultrafilter on the set of prime numbers. Then $\prod_{\mathcal{U}} \mathcal{K}_p \models \mathrm{VFA}_0$.
2. Let $(k, \overline{\sigma}) \models \mathrm{ACFA}_0$ (e.g. $k = \mathbb{C}$ and $\overline{\sigma}$ a sufficiently 'generic' automorphism of $\mathbb{C}$), and let Γ be a non-trivial ordered vector space over $\mathbb{Q}(\sigma)$. Then $K := k((\Gamma)) \models \mathrm{VFA}_0$.

2.4. **Some results on extensions of valued difference fields.** We now list a number of results which were used by Durhan in the proof of Fact 2.9. We adapt them for our purposes.

Assumption 2.13. From now on until the end of the paper, all valued difference fields are assumed to be contractive and of (equal) characteristic 0.

Lemma 2.14. *Let (K, Γ, k) be a σ-henselian valued difference field, (K_0, Γ_0, k_0) be a valued difference subfield, and let $k_0 \subseteq l \subseteq k$, with l some relatively algebraically closed difference subfield of k.*

Then there is a difference subfield $K_0 \subseteq L \subseteq K$ such that $k_L = l$ and $\mathrm{td}(L'/K_0) = \mathrm{td}(k_{L'}/k_0)$ *for every field $K_0 \subseteq L' \subseteq L$ with L' finitely generated (as a field) over K_0. In particular, Γ_L/Γ_0 is a torsion group, and if l/k_0 is σ-algebraic, then L/K_0 is σ-algebraic, too.*

Proof. Using Fact 2.2 and induction, it is enough to treat the case where $l = (k_0\langle\overline{a}\rangle)^{alg} \cap k$ for some element $\overline{a} \in l$. The case where $\overline{a}$ is σ-transcendent over k_0 is clear. We may thus assume that $\overline{a}$ is σ-algebraic over k_0.

Choose a minimal σ-polynomial $\overline{g}(X) \in k_0[X]_\sigma$ of $\overline{a}$ over k_0, and let $g(X) \in \mathcal{O}_{K_0}[X]_\sigma$ be an *exact lift*, i.e. g reduces to $\overline{g}$ and all non-zero coefficients of g have valuation 0. (In particular, $\overline{g}$ and g have the same complexity.) If $g(a) = 0$, we are done. Else $\mathrm{val}(g(a)) > 0$ and $\mathrm{val}(g_\mu(a)) = 0$ for all $\mu \neq 0$ such that $g_\mu(X) \neq 0$, by minimality of $\overline{g}$ and our choice (exactness) of the lift. In other words, $(g(X), a)$ is in σ-Hensel configuration and we find $a' \in K$ such that $g(a') = 0$ and $\overline{a'} = \overline{a}$. We may thus put $L := (K_0\langle a'\rangle)^{alg} \cap K$. □

Recall that a sequence $(a_\rho)_{\rho<\alpha}$, indexed by some limit ordinal α, is called *pseudo Cauchy* (p.c. for short) if $\mathrm{val}(a_{\rho'} - a_\rho) < \mathrm{val}(a_{\rho''} - a_{\rho'})$ for all $\rho < \rho' < \rho'' < \alpha$. An element a is a *pseudo-limit* of the sequence (a_ρ) if $\mathrm{val}(a_\rho - a) = \mathrm{val}(a_\rho - a_{\rho+1})$ for all $\rho < \alpha$. We will denote this by $a_\rho \Rightarrow a$.

If $g(X) \in K[X]_\sigma$ and (a_ρ) is a p.c. sequence in K, then the sequence $(g(a_\rho))$ is eventually p.c., i.e. there is $\rho_0 < \alpha$ such that $(g(a_\rho))_{\rho_0 \leq \rho < \alpha}$ is a p.c. sequence. Moreover, if g is non-constant, it is pseudo-continuous, which means that $a_\rho \Rightarrow a$ implies that $g(a_\rho) \Rightarrow g(a)$. (See [Azg10, Lemma 4.1].)

Definition 2.15. A p.c. sequence (a_ρ) in a valued difference field K is said to be of *σ-algebraic type over K* if there is some non-constant $g(X) \in K[X]_\sigma$ such that $g(a_\rho) \Rightarrow 0$; else we say that it is of *σ-transcendental type over K*.

Fact 2.16. *Let (a_ρ) be a p.c. sequence of σ-transcendental type over K. Then there exists an immediate extension $L = K\langle a\rangle$ with the following properties:*

(1) a is σ-transcendental over K and $a_\rho \Rightarrow a$.
(2) For any valued difference field extension L' of K and $a' \in L'$ such that $a_\rho \Rightarrow a'$, there is a unique embedding $\iota : L \hookrightarrow L'$ with $\iota(a) = a'$.

In particular, the condition '$a_\rho \Rightarrow x$' determines a complete 1-type over K in any completion of T_0^{ac}.

Proof. Existence and uniqueness of the extension given by a pseudo-limit of a p.c. sequence of σ-transcendental type is [Azg10, Lemma 5.1]. Completeness of the type of a pseudo-limit then follows by quantifier elimination (Fact 2.9). □

The following result follows from [Azg10, Lemma 5.9].

Fact 2.17. *Let (a_ρ) be a p.c. sequence of σ-algebraic type over the valued difference field $\mathcal{K} = (K, \Gamma_K, k_K)$, and let $\mathcal{U} \supseteq \mathcal{K}$ be $|\Gamma_K|^+$-saturated and σ-henselian. Then there is an element $a \in \mathbf{K}(\mathcal{U})$ which is σ-algebraic over K and such that $a_\rho \Rightarrow a$.* □

Let T be an (arbitrary) first order theory, $\mathbb{M} \models T$ a monster model, and let X and D be definable sets. Recall that X is said to be *D-analysable in 1 step* (also called *D-internal*) if there is a definable injective function $f : X \hookrightarrow D^{eq}$, i.e. $f : X \hookrightarrow D^n/E$, where E is a definable equivalence relation on n-tuples from D. Here, 'definable' means $\mathbb{M}$-definable.

Inductively, X is said to be *D-analysable in $n+1$ steps* if there is a definable function $f : X \to D^{eq}$ such that every fiber $X_{\overline{d}}$ of f is D-analysable in n steps.

We already observed (see the discussion before Fact 2.4) that $\mathrm{res}\restriction_{\mathrm{Fix}(\sigma)}$ defines an embedding of $\mathrm{Fix}(\sigma)$ into the residue field. In order to formulate a generalisation of this, for convenience, we will fix a completion T of T_0^{ac} and a monster model $\mathbb{M} \models T$. Let $\mathcal{K} = (K, \Gamma, k) \subseteq \mathbb{M}$ be a small substructure. A $\mathcal{K}$-definable subset $X \subseteq \mathbf{K}(\mathbb{M})$ is said to be of *finite total dimension* if every $d \in X(\mathbb{M})$ is σ-algebraic over K.

Fact 2.18 (Hrushovski)**.** *Let $X \subseteq \mathbf{K}(\mathbb{M})$ be of* finite total dimension*. Then, X is $\mathbf{k}$-analysable in n steps, for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$. More precisely, the maps in the steps of the analysis can be taken to be of the form $f : X \to \mathbf{k}$, $x \mapsto \mathrm{res}(cx - b)$.*

Indeed, Hrushovski observes that a set X of finite total dimension is *scattered*, i.e. the set $D_X := \{\mathrm{val}(d - d') \mid d, d' \in X(\mathbb{M})\}$ is finite. The analysis using the particular functions is then an easy consequence (see [Hru04, p.63-64]).

3. Indiscernible arrays and NTP$_2$

In this section we recall some facts about NTP$_2$ and prove some new lemmas. As usual, we fix a monster model $\mathbb{M}$. We don't distinguish here between finite and infinite tuples unless mentioned explicitly, and $\bar{a}$, $\bar{b}$, ... denote infinite sequences.

Definition 3.1. We say that $\varphi(x, y)$ has TP$_2$ if there are $(a_{ij})_{i,j\in\omega}$ and $k \in \omega$ such that:

(1) $\{\varphi(x, a_{ij})\}_{j\in\omega}$ is k-inconsistent for every $i \in \omega$.

(2) $\{\varphi(x, a_{if(i)})\}_{i\in\omega}$ is consistent for every $f : \omega \to \omega$.

A theory is called NTP$_2$ if no formula has TP$_2$.

Fact 3.2. *If a theory T is simple or* NIP*, then it is* NTP$_2$.

Fact 3.3 ([Che12])**.** *If T is not* NTP$_2$*, then already some $\varphi(x, y)$ with $|x| = 1$ has* TP$_2$.

Definition 3.4. We say that $(c_{ij})_{i,j\in\kappa}$ is a *very indiscernible array* if $\bar{c}_i = (c_{ij})_{j\in\kappa}$ is indiscernible over $\bar{c}_{\neq i}$ for all i and $(\bar{c}_i)_{i\in\kappa}$ is an indiscernible sequence (of sequences).

We start with some auxiliary results on finding indiscernible sequences and arrays.

Lemma 3.5.

(1) *Let C be a small set, $\bar{a} = (a_i)_{i\in\omega}$ be a C-indiscernible sequence, b given, and let $p(x, a_0) = \mathrm{tp}(b/a_0C)$. Assume that $\bigcup_{i\in\omega} p(x, a_i)$ is consistent. Then there is some $\bar{a}'$ indiscernible over bC and such that $\bar{a}' \equiv_{a_0C} \bar{a}$.*

(2) *Assume that we are given $(\bar{a}_i)_{i\in\kappa}$ and a small set C such that $\bar{a}_i$ is indiscernible over $\bar{a}_{<i}(a_{j0})_{j>i}C$ for all $i \in \kappa$. Then there exists an array $(\bar{a}'_i)_{i\in\kappa}$ such that $\bar{a}'_i \equiv_{a_{i0}C} \bar{a}_i$ and $\bar{a}'_i$ is indiscernible over $\bar{a}'_{\neq i}C$ for all i.*

(3) *Let C be a small set and $(a_{\alpha i})_{\alpha<n, i<\omega}$ be an array with $n < \omega$. Then for any finite $\Delta \in L(C)$ and $N < \omega$ we can find Δ-mutually indiscernible sequences $(a_{\alpha,i_{\alpha 0}}, ..., a_{\alpha,i_{\alpha N}}) \subset \bar{a}_\alpha$, $i_{\alpha 0} < \ldots < i_{\alpha N} \in \omega$, $\alpha < n$.*

Proof. (1) By automorphism it is enough to find $b' \equiv_{a_0C} b$ such that $\bar{a}$ is indiscernible over $b'C$. Let Δ be an arbitrary finite set of formulas over C. Let $b^+ \models \bigcup_{i\in\omega} p(x, a_i)$. By Ramsey there is an infinite subsequence $\bar{a}^+$ of $\bar{a}$ which is Δ-indiscernible over b^+. Let σ be a C-automorphism sending $\bar{a}^+$ to $\bar{a}$. Then $\bar{a}$ is Δ-indiscernible over $\sigma(b^+)$ and $\sigma(b^+) \equiv_{a_0C} b$. We find b' by compactness.

(2) By compactness, it is enough to prove the statement for finite κ. Let $\Delta \in L(C)$ finite and $N \in \omega$ be arbitrary. By (3) we can find Δ-mutually indiscernible sequences $\bar{a}^+_\alpha = (a_{\alpha,i_{\alpha 0}}, ..., a_{\alpha,i_{\alpha N}}) \subset \bar{a}_\alpha$ for $\alpha \in \kappa$. It follows from the assumption that $a_{0,i_{00}} a_{1,i_{10}} \ldots a_{\kappa-1,i_{(\kappa-1)0}} \equiv_C a_{00}a_{10} \ldots a_{(\kappa-1)0}$. Let σ be a C-automorphism sending the former to the latter. Then we have:

- $\sigma(\bar{a}^+_0), \ldots, \sigma(\bar{a}^+_{\kappa-1})$ are mutually Δ-indiscernible,
- $a_{\alpha,i_{\alpha 0}}, ..., a_{\alpha,i_{\alpha N}} \equiv_C a_{\alpha 0} \ldots a_{\alpha N}$ by indiscernibility, so $\sigma(\bar{a}^+_\alpha) \equiv_C (a_{\alpha i})_{i\leq N}$, which together with $\sigma(a_{\alpha,i_{\alpha 0}}) = a_{\alpha 0}$ implies that $\sigma(\bar{a}^+_\alpha) \equiv_{a_{\alpha 0}C} (a_{\alpha i})_{i\leq N}$, for each α.

By compactness we find $\bar{a}'_0, \ldots, \bar{a}'_{\kappa-1}$ as wanted.

(3) By the finitary Ramsey theorem there are natural numbers $(N_\alpha)_{\alpha<n}$ such that for every set A of size $\sum_{\beta<\alpha} N_\alpha + (n - \alpha) \times N$, every sequence of elements of length N_α contains a subsequence of length N which is Δ-indiscernible over it.

Let $\bar{a}^+_\alpha = (a_{\alpha i})_{i<N_\alpha}$. By reverse induction and the choice of N_α we can find $\bar{a}'_\alpha$ such that:

- $\bar{a}'_\alpha$ is a subsequence of $\bar{a}^+_\alpha$,
- $|\bar{a}'_\alpha| = N$,
- $\bar{a}'_\alpha$ is Δ-indiscernible over $\bar{a}^+_{<\alpha}\bar{a}'_{>\alpha}$.

But then $\bar{a}'_0, \ldots, \bar{a}'_{n-1}$ are as wanted. □

Lemma 3.6. *Let $(c_{ij})_{i,j\in\omega}$ be a very indiscernible array such that $(\bar{c}_i)_{i\in\omega}$ is indiscernible over a, and let b be given. Then we can find b_{ij} such that $(b_{ij}c_{ij})_{i,j\in\omega}$ is a very indiscernible array, $bc_{00}\equiv b_{ij}c_{ij}$ for all i,j and $\left(\bar{b}_i\bar{c}_i\right)_{i\in\omega}$ is indiscernible over a.*

Proof. Set $b_{00}=b$ and let b_{ij} be such that $b_{ij}c_{ij}\equiv b_{00}c_{00}$. By Lemma 3.5(3), automorphism and compactness we may assume that $\left(\bar{b}_i\bar{c}_i\right)_{i\in\omega}$ are mutually indiscernible. By Ramsey, a-automorphism and compactness we may assume in addition that $\left(\bar{b}_i\bar{c}_i\right)_{i\in\omega}$ is indiscernible over a. □

Given a definable set D, by D_{ind} we mean the full induced structure on it. The next lemma is a generalisation of [Che12, Lemma 10].

Lemma 3.7. *Let a definable set D be stably embedded and assume that D_{ind} is* NTP$_2$*. Let $\bar{b}\subset D$ with $|\bar{b}|\leq\lambda$ be given.*

Assume that $(\bar{c}_i)_{i\in\kappa}$ is an array with mutually indiscernible rows over C. If $\kappa\geq(\lambda+|T|)^+$, then there is $i\in\kappa$ and $\bar{c}'$ such that:

- $\bar{c}'\equiv_{c_{i0}C}\bar{c}_i$
- *$\bar{c}'$ is indiscernible over $C\bar{b}$.*

Proof. Let $p_i(\bar{x},c_{i0})=\mathrm{tp}(\bar{b}/c_{i0}C)$.

We claim that $\bigcup_{j\in\omega}p(\bar{x},c_{ij})$ is consistent for some $i\in\kappa$.

Assume not, then by compactness and indiscernibility, for every $i\in\kappa$ we have some $\varphi_i(x_i,c_{i0}d_i)\in p_i$ (with finite $x_i\subset\bar{x}$), $d_i\in C$, and $k_i\in\omega$ such that $\{\varphi_i(x_i,c_{ij}d_i)\}_{j\in\omega}$ is k_i-inconsistent. As κ was chosen large enough, by throwing some rows away we may assume that $\varphi_i=\varphi$, $x_i=x$ and $k_i=k$. As D is stably embedded, there is some $\psi(x,e_{00})$ with $e_{00}\in D$ and such that $\psi(x,e_{00})\cap D=\varphi(x,c_{00}d_0)\cap D$. By indiscernibility of the array, we can find $e_{ij}\in D$ such that $\psi(x,e_{ij})\cap D=\varphi(x,c_{ij}d_i)\cap D$ for all i,j. But then we have:

- $\{\psi(x,e_{ij})\wedge D(x)\}_{j\in\omega}$ is k-inconsistent for every i,
- $\left\{\psi(x,e_{if(i)})\wedge D(x)\right\}_{i\in\kappa}$ is consistent (as was witnessed by $\bar{b}$, together with the indiscernibility).

This is a contradiction to D_{ind} being NTP$_2$.

So let i be as given by the claim. But then by Lemma 3.5(1) we can find $\bar{c}'\equiv_{c_{i0}C}\bar{c}_i$ such that $\bar{c}'$ is indiscernible over $\bar{b}C$. □

Lemma 3.8 (The Array Extension Lemma)**.** *Let D be a stably embedded definable set and assume that D_{ind} is* NTP$_2$*.*

Assume that

- *$(\bar{c}_i)_{i\in\omega}$ is indiscernible over a,*
- *$(c_{ij})_{i,j\in\omega}$ is a very indiscernible array.*

Let a small $b\subseteq D$ be given. Then we can find $\left(c^*_{ij}\right)_{i,j\in\omega}$ and $\left(b^*_{ij}\right)_{i,j\in\omega}$ such that:

1. *$\left(\bar{b}^*_i\bar{c}^*_i\right)_{i\in\omega}$ is indiscernible over a,*
2. *$\left(\bar{b}^*_i\bar{c}^*_i\right)_{i\in\omega}$ are mutually indiscernible,*
3. *$\bar{c}^*_i\equiv_{c_{i0}}\bar{c}_i$ for all $i\in\omega$ (so in particular $c^*_{i0}=c_{i0}$),*
4. *$abc_{00}\equiv ab^*_{00}c^*_{00}$.*

In particular $\left(b^*_{ij}c^*_{ij}\right)_{i,j\in\omega}$ is a very indiscernible array.

Proof. By compactness, it suffices to prove the result for finite b.

First, by indiscernibility, Ramsey and automorphisms over a, we can find b_i such that $ab_i\bar{c}_i \equiv ab\bar{c}_0$ and $(b_i\bar{c}_i)_{i\in\omega}$ is indiscernible over a.

Again by compactness, indiscernibility and automorphisms over a, it is enough to find $\bar{c}^*_{<n}, \bar{b}^*_{<n}$ satisfying (2)–(4) for every $n \in \omega$.

So fix $n \in \omega$ and let $I = I_0 + I_1 + \ldots + I_{n-1} = |T|^+ + \ldots + |T|^{+n}$ (where for a cardinal κ we let κ^{+n} denote the nth successor of κ). By compactness we may expand our sequence to $(b_i\bar{c}_i)_{i\in I}$ with the same Ehrefeucht-Mostowski type over a.

By reverse induction on $k < n$ we find i_k, $\bar{c}^+_k$, $\bar{b}^+_k$ such that:

(a) $i_k \in I_k$,
(b) $\bar{c}^+_k \equiv_{c_{i_k 0}} \bar{c}_{i_k}$ (so in particular $c^+_{k0} = c_{i_k 0}$),
(c) $\bar{c}_{\in I_{<k}}\bar{c}^+_k\bar{c}^+_{k+1}\ldots\bar{c}^+_n \equiv \bar{c}_{\in I_{<k}}\bar{c}_{i_k}\bar{c}_{i_{k+1}}\ldots\bar{c}_{i_n}$,
(d) $b^+_{k0} = b_{i_k}$ and $\bar{b}^+_k \subseteq D$,
(e) $\left(b^+_{kj}c^+_{kj}\right)_{j\in\omega}$ is indiscernible over $\bar{b}^+_{>k}\bar{c}^+_{>k}b_{\in I_{<k}}\bar{c}_{\in I_{<k}}$.

In step k, let $C = \bar{c}^+_{>k}\bar{c}_{\in I_{<k}}$ and $\bar{b} = \bar{b}^+_{>k}b_{\in I_{<k}}$. Then $\bar{b} \subseteq D$, $\left|\bar{b}\right| \leq |T|^{+k}$ and $(\bar{c}_i)_{i\in I_k}$ are mutually indiscernible over C (by (c) for $k+1, \ldots, n-1$ and the assumption on $(\bar{c}_i)_{i\in I}$). As $I_k = |T|^{+(k+1)}$, it follows by Lemma 3.7 that there is some $i_k \in I_k$ and $\bar{c}'_k$ indiscernible over $\bar{b}C$ and such that $\bar{c}'_k \equiv_{c_{i_k 0}C} \bar{c}_{i_k}$. Let $b'_{k0} = b_{i_k}$ and b'_{kj} be such that $b'_{k0}c'_{k0} \equiv_{\bar{b}C} b'_{kj}c'_{kj}$. By Ramsey, compactness and $\bar{b}C$-automorphisms we can find a $\bar{b}C$-indiscernible sequence $\left(b^+_{kj}c^+_{kj}\right)_{j\in\omega}$ such that $b^+_{k0}c^+_{k0} = b'_{k0}c'_{k0}$ and $\bar{c}^+_k \equiv_{\bar{b}C} \bar{c}'_k$. Now (b) and (c) follow from (c) for $k+1$, and $\bar{c}^+_k \equiv_C \bar{c}'_k \equiv_C \bar{c}_{i_k}$ and $c^+_{k0} = c_{i_k 0}$. Parts (a), (d) and (e) are clearly satisfied by construction.

By Lemma 3.5(2) and (e) we find sequences $\left(b^{++}_{kj}c^{++}_{kj}\right)_{j\in\omega}$ for $k < n$ which are mutually indiscernible and such that $\bar{c}^{++}_k\bar{b}^{++}_k \equiv_{b^+_{k0}c^+_{k0}} \bar{c}^+_k\bar{b}^+_k$.

Finally, let σ be an a-automorphism sending $b_{i_{<n}}\bar{c}_{i_{<n}}$ to $b_{<n}\bar{c}_{<n}$, and let $\bar{b}^*_k = \sigma\left(\bar{b}^{++}_k\right)$ and $\bar{c}^*_k = \sigma\left(\bar{c}^{++}_k\right)$ for $k < n$.

We have:

- $\left(\bar{b}^*_k\bar{c}^*_k\right)_{k<n}$ are mutually indiscernible (as $\left(\bar{b}^{++}_k\bar{c}^{++}_k\right)_{k<n}$ are),
- $\bar{c}^*_k \equiv_{c_{k0}} \bar{c}_k$ (as $\bar{c}^{++}_k \equiv_{c^+_{k0}} \bar{c}^+_k$, $\bar{c}^+_k \equiv_{c_{i_k 0}} \bar{c}_{i_k}$, $c^+_{k0} = c_{i_k 0}$ and σ is an automorphism),
- $abc_{00} \equiv ab^*_{00}c^*_{00}$ as $b^*_{00}c^*_{00} = b_0c_{00}$ by the construction and $ab_0c_{00} \equiv abc_{00}$.

□

Lemma 3.9. *In Lemma 3.8 it is enough to assume that $b \subset E$ for some definable set E analysable in D.*

Proof. As before, it is enough to prove the result for finite b. So we may as well assume that b is a singleton. We prove the result for n-step analysability by induction on n.

Assume first $n > 1$. There is an $\mathbb{M}$-definable function $f : E \to D^{eq}$ such that all fibers of f are analysable in D in $n-1$ steps. Using Lemma 3.6 and replacing the array $(c_{ij})_{i,j\in\omega}$ by an array of the form $(a_{ij}c_{ij})_{i,j\in\omega}$, we may assume that f is c_{00}-definable. Applying Lemma 3.8 to $\beta := f(b) \in D^{eq}$ (of course $(D^{eq})_{\text{ind}}$ is NTP$_2$ as

D_{ind} was), we find $\left(c^*_{ij}\right)_{i,j\in\omega}$ and $\left(\beta^*_{ij}\right)_{i,j\in\omega}$ such that $\left(\bar{\beta}^*_i\bar{c}^*_i\right)_{i\in\omega}$ is indiscernible over a, $\left(\bar{\beta}^*_i\bar{c}^*_i\right)_{i\in\omega}$ are mutually indiscernible, $\bar{c}^*_i \equiv_{c_{i0}} \bar{c}_i$ for all $i\in\omega$ and $a\beta c_{00} \equiv a\beta^*_{00}c^*_{00}$.

But now $b\in f^{-1}(\beta)\cap E$, a definable set which is analysable in D in $n-1$ steps. Using induction, it is straightforward to check that one may reduce in this manner to the case $n=1$. Now there is an $\mathbb{M}$-definable embedding f of E into D^{eq}. As before, passing to a larger array, we may assume that f is defined over c_{00}; in addition, using Lemma 3.6 again, we may assume that there is $b'\in c_{00}$ such that $f(b')=f(b)$. But then $b=b'\in c_{00}$ by injectivity of f, so we are done. □

Lemma 3.10. *In any theory, $\varphi(x,y)$ has TP_2 if and only if there is a very indiscernible array $(a_{ij})_{i,j\in\omega}$ witnessing it (as in Definition 3.1) and $c\models\{\varphi(x,a_{ij})\}_{i,j\in\omega}$ such that the sequence of rows $(\bar{a}_i)_{i\in\omega}$ is indiscernible over c.*

Proof. By Lemma 3.5(3), Ramsey and compactness. □

Remark 3.11. The method of the proof of Theorem 4.1 may be combined with Lemmas 3.9 and 3.10 to show that if D is a stably embedded definable set such that D_{ind} is NTP_2 and E is a D-analysable definable set, then E_{ind} is NTP_2. We ommit the details as we don't see any application of this result at the moment.

The following result on preservation of NTP_2 for valued fields (without an automorphism) is analogous to the main result of our paper.

Fact 3.12 ([Che12])**.** *Let $\mathcal{K}=(K,\Gamma,k)$ be a henselian valued field of equicharacteristic 0 in the Denef-Pas language. Assume that the theory of k is NTP_2. Then the theory of $\mathcal{K}$ is NTP_2.*

4. PRESERVATION OF NTP_2

In this section, we fix a completion T of T_0^{ac}, so T is of the form $T_0^{\mathrm{ac}}\cup T_r\cup T_v$, where T_r is a complete theory of difference fields of characteristic 0 (which has to be assumed to be linearly difference closed by Remark 2.6) and T_v is a complete theory of ordered $\mathbb{Z}[\sigma]$-modules.

Theorem 4.1. *Assume that both T_r and T_v are NTP_2. Then, T is NTP_2.*

Corollary 4.2. *Every completion of* VFA_0 *is* NTP_2*.*

Proof. Every completion of ACFA_0 is simple by [CH99], so in particular it is NTP_2 by Fact 3.2. The theory IncDODG is *o*-minimal by Fact 2.1, so in particular it is NIP and thus NTP_2, by Fact 3.2. □

We will need a combinatorial lemma on intersections of balls.

Lemma 4.3. *Let $\mathbb{M}$ be a monster model of an arbitrary theory of valued fields.*

Let $a\in\mathbb{M}$ be a singleton, and let $(M_i)_{i\in\{-1\}\cup\mathbb{N}}$ be an a-indiscernible sequence of (small) subfields of $\mathbb{M}$ such that $M_0(a)$ is an immediate extension of M_0. For $i\geq -1$, let B_i be the intersection of all M_i-definable balls containing a. Suppose that $(N_j)_{j\in\mathbb{N}}$ is an $M_{\neq 0}$-indiscernible sequence of subfields of $\mathbb{M}$ such that $M_0=N_0$. Let C_j be the conjugate of $B_0=C_0$ under the automorphism sending M_0 to N_j. Then, $a\in\bigcap_{j\in\mathbb{N}}C_i$.

Proof. The combinatorics of type-definable balls is very simple: if two such balls are not disjoint, one of them is contained in the other. Since $a\in B_i$ for all i, by a-indiscernibility of the sequence (M_i), there are three possibilities:

(1) $B_i = B_0$ for all i. Then, $C_i = B_0$ for all i, by $M_{\neq 0}$-indiscernibility of $(N_i)_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$, and the result follows.
(2) $B_i \subsetneq B_{i+1}$ for all i. Then $C_0 = B_0 \supseteq B_{-1}$, so $C_i \supseteq B_{-1}$ for all i by indiscernibility of $(N_i)_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$ over $M_{\neq 0}$, and thus $a \in \bigcap_{j\in\mathbb{N}} C_i$.
(3) $B_i \supsetneq B_{i+1}$ for all i. Then, $C_i \supseteq B_1$ for all i, and one may conclude as before. □

Proof of Theorem 4.1. We fix some monster model $\mathbb{M} \models T$. Suppose there is a formula $\varphi(x, y)$ with TP$_2$. By Fact 3.3, we may assume that $\mid x \mid= 1$ and that x is a variable from the valued field sort $\mathbf{K}$. Let $(a_{ij})_{i,j\in\omega}$ be an array witnessing that $\varphi(x, y)$ has TP$_2$, and let $a \models \bigwedge_{i\in\omega} \varphi(x, a_{i0})$ be a realisation of the first column. By Lemma 3.10 we may assume that:

- $(a_{ij})_{i,j\in\omega}$ is a very indiscernible array;
- the sequence of rows $(\overline{a}_i)_{i\in\omega}$ is a-indiscernible.

In our proof, we will successively construct arrays (a^{α}_{ij}), where α is a countable ordinal and a^{α}_{ij} is a countable tuple from $\mathbb{M}$, starting with $a^0_{ij} = a_{ij}$, and such that, for any $\beta > \alpha$, there is a decomposition $(a^{\beta}_{ij}) = (a^*_{ij} b^*_{ij})$ satisfying

(1) $(a^{\beta}_{ij})_{i,j\in\omega}$ is a very indiscernible array;
(2) the sequence of rows $(\overline{a}^{\beta}_i)_{i\in\omega}$ is a-indiscernible, and
(3) $\overline{a}^*_i \equiv_{a^{\alpha}_{i,0}} \overline{a}^{\alpha}_i$ for all $i \in \omega$.

It follows from (3) that the the first column is just an extension of the original one, and that in particular we still have $a \models \bigwedge_{i\in\omega} \varphi(x, a^{\beta}_{i0})$. Also by (3), the rows $\{\varphi(x, a^{\beta}_{ij})\}_{j\in\omega}$ are still inconsistent. As a consequence, for any β, the array (a^{β}_{ij}) witnesses that φ has TP$_2$.

Even though only the first column $(a^{\alpha}_{i0})_{i\in\omega}$ has to be a subtuple of (a^{β}_{i0}), we will say, somewhat inaccurately, that we *extend* the array, when we pass from (a^{α}_{ij}) to (a^{β}_{ij}). An extension of arrays will be called *good* if it satisfies the properties (1-3) above.

The construction is done in steps, mainly following the back-and-forth system from [Azg07] used to prove the elimination of field quantifiers in T^{ac}_0 (Fact 2.9). There will be two kinds of successor steps: *auxiliary steps*, where Lemma 3.6 is used to extend the array (a^{α}_{ij}) carelessly, to add new parameters; *treating steps*, where the Array Extension Lemma (Lemma 3.8) is used to extend the array (a^{α}_{ij}) carefully, respecting partial information from $\mathrm{tp}(a/a^{\alpha}_{00})$ coming from the NTP$_2$ sorts $\mathbf{\Gamma}$ and $\mathbf{k}$.

If λ is a limit ordinal and (a^{α}_{ij}) have been constructed such that (a^{β}_{ij}) is a good extension of (a^{α}_{ij}) for all $\alpha < \beta < \lambda$, we may find an array (a^{λ}_{ij}) with $a^{\lambda}_{00} = \bigcup_{\alpha<\lambda} a^{\alpha}_{00}$ and such that (a^{λ}_{ij}) is a good extension of (a^{α}_{ij}), for all $\alpha < \lambda$. Indeed, this follows from compactness, as properties (1-3) are type-definable in the variables $(x^{\lambda}_{ij})_{i,j\in\omega}$. The final step (immediate extension of σ-transcendental type) will follow from Lemma 4.3.

(I) Given (a^{α}_{ij}), there is a good extension $(a^{\alpha+1}_{ij})$ such that $(a^{\alpha+1}_{00})$ enumerates a substructure $\mathcal{K}^{\alpha+1} = (K^{\alpha+1}, k^{\alpha+1}, \Gamma^{\alpha+1})$ with $K^{\alpha+1}$ a difference field which is relatively algebraically closed in $\mathbf{K}(\mathbb{M})$, $k^{\alpha+1}$ a difference field which is

relatively algebraically closed in $\mathbf{k}(\mathbb{M})$, and $\Gamma^{\alpha+1}$ a relatively divisible a $\mathbb{Z}[\sigma]$-submodule of $\mathbf{\Gamma}(\mathbb{M})$.
[By Lemma 3.6.]

In what follows, we may always assume that a_{00}^{α} is as in the conclusion of step I. To ease the notation, we write $a_{00}^{\alpha} = (K, k, \Gamma)$ and $a_{00}^{\alpha+1} = (K', k', \Gamma')$. Let $L := K\langle a\rangle$, and $L' := K'\langle a\rangle$.

(II) Given (K, k, Γ), there is a good extension such that $k_{K'} = k' = k$. Moreover, if k is σ-algebraic over k_K, then K' may be chosen to be σ-algebraic over K.
[By Lemma 2.14 combined with Lemma 3.6.]

(III) Given (K, k, Γ), there is a good extension such that $\Gamma_{K'} = \Gamma' = \Gamma$.
[By Lemma 3.6.]

(IV) Given (K, k, Γ), there is a good extension such that $k_L \subseteq k'$.
[By Lemma 3.8, as $\mathbf{k}$ is stably embedded (Fact 2.9), and NTP_2 by assumption.]

(V) Given (K, k, Γ), there is a good extension such that $\Gamma_L \subseteq \Gamma'$. .
[By Lemma 3.8, as $\mathbf{\Gamma}$ is stably embedded (Fact 2.9), and NTP_2 by assumption.]

Iterating steps I-V and passing to the limit, we may thus construct a good extension (a_{ij}^{α}) such that (K, k, Γ) is coming from a valued difference field (i.e. $k = k_K$ and $\Gamma = \Gamma_K$) and such that L/K is an immediate extension.

(VI) If a is σ-algebraic over K, there is a good extension such that $a \in K'$. But then by indiscernibility a is a solution of $\{\varphi(x, a_{ij}^{\alpha+1})\}_{i,j\in\omega}$, a contradiction.
[Let $X \subseteq \mathbf{K}$ be a K-definable set of finite total dimension such that $a \in X$. By Fact 2.18, X is $\mathbf{k}$-analysable. Applying Lemma 3.9 with $a = b$, we are done.]

The remaining case is when L/K is immediate and σ-transcendent, which we will now assume.

(VII) If L/K is immediate and σ-transcendent, there is a good extension such that L'/K' is immediate and a is of σ-transcendental type over K'.
[Choose $(a_\rho)_{\rho<\lambda}$, a p.c. sequence in K without pseudo-limit in K such that $a_\rho \Rightarrow a$. Suppose $(a_\rho)_{\rho<\lambda}$ is of σ-algebraic type over K. By Fact 2.17 and $\aleph_1$-saturation of $\mathbb{M}$ there is $a' \in \mathbf{K}(\mathbb{M})$ such that $a_\rho \Rightarrow a'$ and a' is σ-algebraic over K.

Since $\Gamma = \Gamma_L$ is relatively divisible, it follows from Fact 2.4 that for every σ-algebraic extension $\tilde{L}$ of L one has $\mathrm{val}(\tilde{L}) = \Gamma$, so in particular $\mathrm{val}(\tilde{K}\langle a\rangle) = \Gamma$ for every σ-algebraic extension $\tilde{K}$ of K. Using steps IV and II we may thus find a good extension with $a' \in K'$, such that K'/K is σ-algebraic and L'/K' is immediate (and still σ-transcendent), with $\Gamma' = \Gamma$.

Now by construction $\mathrm{val}(a - a') > \mathrm{val}(a - a_\rho)$ for all ρ, so there is a p.c. sequence in K' pseudo-converging to a and without pseudolimit in K' which approximates a better than the initial p.c. sequence. If the extension is still of σ-algebraic type, we may repeat this construction, taking unions at limit ordinals. As Γ is countable, after countably many steps we must find a p.c. sequence of σ-transcendental type.]

(VIII) If L/K is a σ-transcendent immediate extension of σ-transcendental type, then $K_{1j} \equiv_a K_{10}$ for all $j \geq 0$.

[Let $(a_\rho)_{\rho<\lambda}$ be a p.c. sequence in K_{10} without pseudolimit in K_{10} such that $a_\rho \Rightarrow a$. Let $\gamma_\rho := \mathrm{val}(a - a_\rho)$, and set

$$B_{10} := \bigcap_{\rho<\lambda} B_{\geq\gamma_\rho}(a_\rho).$$

Note that B_{10} equals the intersection of *all* K_{10}-definable balls containing a. By Fact 2.16, the type $p_{10}(x) := \mathrm{tp}(a/K_{10})$ is completely determined by the condition $x \in B_{10}$. It follows from Lemma 4.3, applied to $M_i := K_{i+1,0}$ (for $i \geq -1$) and $N_j := K_{1j}$, that $a \in B_{1j}$ for all $j \geq 0$, where B_{1j} is the automorphic image of B_{10} under an automorphism sending K_{10} to K_{1j}. Invoking Fact 2.16 again, we deduce that $K_{1j} \equiv_a K_{10}$ for all $j \geq 0$.]

It follows from step (VIII) that we may assume that $a \models \{\varphi(x, a^\alpha_{1j})\}_{j<\omega}$, as $\models \varphi(a, a^\alpha_{10})$. But $\{\varphi(x, a^\alpha_{ij})\}_{i,j<\omega}$ is a witness that $\varphi(x, y)$ is TP$_2$, so in particular $\{\varphi(x, a^\alpha_{1j})\}_{j<\omega}$ is inconsistent. This is a contradiction. ☐

In fact, using stable embeddedness and orthogonality of the sorts $\mathbf{k}$ and $\mathbf{\Gamma}$ (Fact 2.9), the previous proof gives the following stronger result.

Remark 4.4. Let $T'_r \supseteq T_r$ and $T'_v \supseteq T_v$ be expansions which are both NTP$_2$. Then, $T' := T^{\mathrm{ac}}_0 \cup T'_r \cup T'_v$ is NTP$_2$. ☐

Remark 4.5. In a similar way, one may give an alternative proof of the corresponding result on preservation of NTP$_2$ in henselian valued fields of equal characteristic 0 (Fact 3.12).

5. Valued difference fields and resilience

Definition 5.1. We say that a formula $\varphi(x, y)$ is *resilient* if it satisfies the following property:

- For any indiscernible sequences $\bar{a} = (a_i)_{i\in\mathbb{Z}}$ and $\bar{b} = (b_i)_{i\in\mathbb{Z}}$ such that $a_0 = b_0$ and $\bar{b}$ is indiscernible over $a_{\neq 0}$, if $\{\varphi(x, a_i)\}_{i\in\mathbb{Z}}$ is consistent, then $\{\varphi(x, b_i)\}_{i\in\mathbb{Z}}$ is consistent.

A theory is resilient if it implies that every formula is resilient. By compactness we may replace $\mathbb{Z}$ by $\mathbb{Q}$ in the definition.

Resilient theories were introduced in [BYC12] where it was observed that every simple or NIP theory is resilient, and that every resilient theory is NTP$_2$. It is not known if there are NTP$_2$ theories which are not resilient.

The purpose of this section is to prove an analogue of the main theorem with respect to resilience instead of NTP$_2$. For this we redevelop the ingredients of the proof in the resilient setting, and the proofs are in fact even more compact than for NTP$_2$. If one is only interested in the proof that VFA$_0$ is NTP$_2$, then this section provides a shorter path.

5.1. One variable is enough.

Lemma 5.2. *The following are equivalent:*

(1) Every formula $\varphi(x, y)$ with $|x| \leq n$ is resilient.

(2) *For every set D, every c with $|c| \leq n$ and every sequence $\bar{a} = (a_i)_{i \in \mathbb{Q}}$ indiscernible over cD, if $\bar{b} = (b_i)_{i \in \omega}$ is indiscernible over $a_{\neq 0}D$ and $b_0 = a_0$, then there exists $\bar{b}'$ indiscernible over $ca_{\neq 0}D$ such that $\bar{b}' \equiv_{\bar{a}D} \bar{b}$.*

(3) *For every set D, every c with $|c| \leq n$ and every sequence $\bar{a} = (a_i)_{i \in \mathbb{Q}}$ indiscernible over cD, if $\bar{b} = (b_i)_{i \in \omega}$ is indiscernible over $a_{\neq 0}D$ and $b_0 = a_0$, then there exists $\bar{b}'$ indiscernible over $ca_{\neq 0}D$ such that $\bar{b}' \equiv_{a_0 D} \bar{b}$.*

Proof. (1) implies (2): Let $\varepsilon > 0$ from $\mathbb{Q}$ be arbitrary, and set $p_\varepsilon(x, a_0) = \operatorname{tp}\left(c/a_0 a_{\notin(-\varepsilon,\varepsilon)} D\right)$. By indiscernibility of $\bar{a}$ over cD it follows that $\bigcup_{i \in (-\varepsilon,\varepsilon)} p_\varepsilon(x, a_i)$ is consistent (realised by c). We claim that $\bigcup_{i \in \omega} p_\varepsilon(x, b_i)$ is consistent. Otherwise there is some $\varphi(x, a_0 a' d) \in p_\varepsilon(x, a_0)$ with $a' \subseteq a_{\notin(-\varepsilon,\varepsilon)}$ and $d \subseteq D$ such that $\{\varphi(x, b_i a' d)\}_{i \in \omega}$ is inconsistent. Let $a'_i = a_i a' d$ and $b'_i = b_i a' d$. Then $\bar{a}' = (a'_i)_{i \in (-\varepsilon,\varepsilon)}$ is indiscernible, $\bar{b}' = (b'_i)_{i \in \omega}$ is indiscernible over $a'_{\neq 0}$, $a'_0 = b'_0$ and they witness that $\varphi(x, y)$ is not resilient — a contradiction.

As $\varepsilon > 0$ was arbitrary, it follows by compactness that, letting $p(x, a_0) = \operatorname{tp}(c/a_0 a_{\neq 0} D) = \bigcup_{\varepsilon > 0} p_\varepsilon(x, a_0)$, we have that $\bigcup_{i \in \omega} p(x, b_i)$ is consistent. But this means that there is $\bar{b}' \equiv_{\bar{a}D} \bar{b}$ which is indiscernible over $ca_{\neq 0}D$ by Lemma 3.5(1).

(2) implies (3) is obvious.

(3) implies (1): Assume that $\varphi(x, y)$ is not resilient, where $|x| \leq n$, and let $\bar{a} = (a_i)_{i \in \mathbb{Q}}, \bar{b} = (b_i)_{i \in \omega}$ witness this. Then by compactness and indiscernibility we may find $c \models \{\varphi(x, a_i)\}_{i \in \mathbb{Q}}$ such that in addition $\bar{a}$ is indiscernible over c. But as $c \models \varphi(x, b_0)$ and $\{\varphi(x, b_i)\}_{i \in \omega}$ is inconsistent, there is no way to make it c-indiscernible keeping the type of $\bar{b}$ even just over the first element. ☐

Corollary 5.3. *If T is not resilient, then there is some $\varphi(x, y)$ with $|x| = 1$ which is not resilient.*

Proof. We show by induction that if T satisfies 5.2(2) for $n - 1 \geq 1$, then it satisfies it for n. So let $c = (c_i)_{i<n}$, $\bar{a}$ and $\bar{b}$ be given, with $\bar{a}$ indiscernible over c and $\bar{b}$ indiscernible over $a_{\neq 0}$. Then by the inductive assumption and Lemma 5.2 with $D = \emptyset$ we find $\bar{b}' \equiv_{\bar{a}} \bar{b}$ and indiscernible over $c_{<n-1} a_{\neq 0}$. Again by the inductive assumption and Lemma 5.2 with $D = c_{<n-1}$ we find a $c_{n-1} c_{<n-1} a_{\neq 0}$-indiscernible $\bar{b}'' \equiv_{\bar{a}} \bar{b}' \equiv_{\bar{a}} \bar{b}$ — as wanted. ☐

5.2. Extending counterexamples.

Modifying the proof of Lemma 5.2 similarly to the proof of Lemma 3.7 we can generalise it and demonstrate the following lemma.

Lemma 5.4. *Let E be a stably embedded definable set such that E_{ind} is resilient. Then for every set D, every small $c \subseteq E$ and every sequence $\bar{a} = (a_i)_{i \in \mathbb{Q}}$ indiscernible over cD, if $\bar{b} = (b_i)_{i \in \omega}$ is indiscernible over $a_{\neq 0}D$ and $b_0 = a_0$, then there exists $\bar{b}'$ indiscernible over $ca_{\neq 0}D$ such that $\bar{b}' \equiv_{\bar{a}D} \bar{b}$.*

We now give an analogue of Lemma 3.6 for the resilient situation.

Lemma 5.5. *Let $\bar{a} = (a_i)_{i \in \mathbb{Q}}$ be indiscernible over c and $\bar{b} = (b_i)_{i \in \mathbb{Q}}$ be indiscernible over $a_{\neq 0}$. For an arbitrary e, we can find $\bar{a}^+ = (a_i a_i^*)_{i \in \mathbb{Q}}$ and $\bar{b}^+ = (b_i^* b_i^{**})_{i \in \mathbb{Q}}$ such that $\bar{a}^+$ is indiscernible over c, $\bar{b}^+$ is indiscernible over $a^+_{\neq 0}$, $\bar{b}^* \equiv_{b_0} \bar{b}$ and $a_0 a_0^* = b_0^* b_0^{**} \equiv a_0 e$.*

The main point of the following lemma is to show that if we have a witness to the failure of resilience of the whole theory, we can always extend elements of $\bar{a}$ and $\bar{b}$ by parameters from resilient sorts. This will serve as an analogue of Lemma 3.8.

Lemma 5.6. *Let E be a stably embedded definable set such that E_{ind} is resilient. Let $\bar{a} = (a_i)_{i\in\mathbb{Q}}$, $\bar{b} = (b_i)_{i\in\mathbb{Q}}$and c be such that:*

1. *$\bar{a}$ is indiscernible over c,*
2. *$\bar{b}$ is indiscernible over $a_{\neq 0}$,*
3. *$a_0 = b_0$.*

Then for any small $e \subseteq E$ there are $\bar{a}^+$ and $\bar{b}^+$ such that:

1. *$\bar{a}^+ = \left(a_i^+\right)_{i\in\mathbb{Q}}$ with $a_i^+ = a_i a_i^*$ is indiscernible over c,*
2. *$\bar{b}^+ = \left(b_i^+\right)_{i\in\mathbb{Q}}$ with $b_i^+ = b_i^* b_i^{**}$is indiscernible over $a_{\neq 0}^+$,*
3. *$a_0 a_0^* = b_0^* b_0^{**}$,*
4. *$\bar{b}^* \equiv_{b_0} \bar{b}$,*
5. *$c a_0 e \equiv c a_0 a_0^*$.*

Proof. By compactness it is enough to treat the case of finite e. By indiscernibility of $\bar{a}$ over c we find a_i' such that $c a_i a_i' \equiv c a_0 e$ for all $i \in \mathbb{Q}$.

Fix any finite set of formulas Δ. By Ramsey and compactness we find some $\left(a_{i_j} a'_{i_j}\right)_{j\in\omega}$ which is Δ-indiscernible over c. By indiscernibility, compactness and c-automorphism, we find some $(a_i^*)_{i\in\mathbb{Q}}$ such that the sequence $\overline{a}^+ = \left(a_i^+\right)_{i\in\mathbb{Q}} = (a_i a_i^*)_{i\in\mathbb{Q}}$ is c-indiscernible and $c a_0 a_0^* \equiv c a_0 e$.

Let $\varepsilon > 0$ from $\mathbb{Q}$ be arbitrary. We have that $a_{\in(-\varepsilon,\varepsilon)}$ is indiscernible over $(a_i a_i^*)_{i\notin(-\varepsilon,\varepsilon)}$ and that $\bar{b}$ is indiscernible over $a_{\neq 0}$. By Lemma 5.4 (with $D = a_{\notin(-\varepsilon,\varepsilon)}$ and $c = a^*_{\notin(-\varepsilon,\varepsilon)} \subseteq E$, E is stably embedded and resilient) there is some $\bar{b}'$ indiscernible over $a_{\neq 0} a^*_{\notin(-\varepsilon,\varepsilon)}$ and such that $\bar{b}' \equiv_{\bar{a}} \bar{b}$.

By compactness we conclude that there is $\bar{b}' \equiv_{a_0} \bar{b}$ indiscernible over $a_{\neq 0}^+$. Let $b_0'' = a_0^*$ and let b_i'' be such that $b_i^{'} b_i^{''} \equiv_{a_{\neq 0}^+} b_0' b_0'' = a_0 a_0^*$. By Ramsey, compactness and $a_{\neq 0}^+$-automorphisms, we can find an $a_{\neq 0}^+$-indiscernible sequence $(b_i^* b_i^{**})_{i\in\mathbb{Q}}$ such that $\bar{b}^* \equiv_{a_0 a_0^*} \bar{b}' \equiv_{a_0} \bar{b}$. Letting $b_i^+ = b_i^* b_i^{**}$ it is now easy to check that all the requirements are satisfied. □

5.3. **The Ax-Kochen principle for resilience of valued (difference) fields.**

Theorem 5.7.
1. *Let $\mathcal{K} = (K, \Gamma, k, v, \mathrm{ac})$ be a henselian valued field of residue characteristic 0, and assume that $\mathrm{Th}(k)$ is resilient. Then $\mathrm{Th}(\mathcal{K})$ is resilient.*
2. *Let $\mathcal{K} = (K, \Gamma, k, v, \mathrm{ac}, \sigma)$ be a contractive σ-henselian valued difference field of equicharacteristic 0. Assume that $\mathrm{Th}(k, \bar{\sigma})$ and $\mathrm{Th}(\Gamma, \sigma_\Gamma)$ are resilient. Then $\mathrm{Th}(\mathcal{K})$ is resilient.*

Proof. The proof of (2) is completely analogous to the proof of Theorem 4.1. Fix some monster model $\mathbb{M}$ of $T := \mathrm{Th}(\mathcal{K})$, and assume that T is not resilient. Then, by Corollary 5.3, this is witnessed by a formula $\varphi(x, y)$ with x a single variable from sort $\mathbf{K}$. Choose $\overline{a} = (a_i)_{i\in\mathbb{Q}}$, $\overline{b} = (b_i)_{i\in\mathbb{Q}}$ and an element c in $\mathbb{M}$ satisfying the following conditions:

- $\overline{a}$ is indiscernible over c;
- $a_0 = b_0$;

- $\overline{b}$ is indiscenible over $a_{\neq 0}$;
- $c \models \{\varphi(x, a_i)\}_{i \in \mathbb{Q}}$, and
- $\{\varphi(x, b_i)\}_{i \in \mathbb{Q}}$ is inconsistent.

As in the proof of Theorem 4.1, we may now 'extend' the parameters of the counterexample step by step, using the back-and-forth system from [Azg07]. In the extension process, Lemma 5.5 is used instead of Lemma 3.6, and Lemma 5.6 instead of Lemma 3.8. We successively construct sequences of countable tuples $\overline{a}^{\alpha} = (a_i^{\alpha})_{i \in \mathbb{Q}}$ and $\overline{b}^{\alpha} = (b_i^{\alpha})_{i \in \mathbb{Q}}$ in $\mathbb{M}$, for α a countable ordinal, starting with $a_i^0 b_i^0 = a_i b_i$, and such that, for any $\beta > \alpha$, there are decompositions $b_i^{\beta} = b_i^* b_i^{**}$ and $a_i^{\beta} = a_i^{\alpha} a_i^*$ satisfying

(1) a^{β} is indiscernible over c,
(2) $a_0^{\beta} = b_0^{\beta}$, and
(3) $\overline{b}^* \equiv_{b_0^{\alpha}} \overline{b}^{\alpha}$.

Since $\overline{a}^{\beta}$ is just an extension of the original sequence $\overline{a}$, in particular we still have $c \models \bigwedge_{i \in \mathbb{Q}} \varphi(x, a_i^{\beta})$. Also by (3), the set $\{\varphi(x, b_i^{\beta})\}_{i \in \mathbb{Q}}$ is still inconsistent. As a consequence, for any β, the sequences $\overline{a}^{\beta}$ and $\overline{b}^{\beta}$ witness that φ is not resilient. As in the proof of Theorem 4.1, we may suppose that at some step of the construction, the tuple a_0^{α} enumerates a valued difference field K_0 such that the extension $K_0\langle a\rangle / K_0$ is immediate of σ-transcendental type. Lemma 4.3, together with Fact 2.16, then implies that $c \models \{\varphi(x, b_i^{\alpha})\}_{i \in \mathbb{Q}}$, contradicting our assumption.

The proof of part (1) of the Theorem is similar (but easier), so we only sketch the argument and leave the details to the reader. A hypothetical counterexample of resilience in one variable is step by step transformed, using the back-and-forth system of Pas [Pas89], until the tuple a_0^{α} enumerates a valued field K_0 such that the extension $K_0(c)/K_0$ is immediate of transcendental type. One may then conclude as before, as in this situation the type $p(x) = \mathrm{tp}(c/K_0)$ is determined by the condition '$x \in B_0$', where B_0 is the intersection of all K_0-definable balls containing c. □

Corollary 5.8. *(1) Any ultraproduct of p-adics is resilient.*
(2) VFA_0 *is resilient.*

As in the case of NTP_2, the proof of Theorem 5.7 shows a bit more.

Remark 5.9. With the notations of Section 4, suppose that $T_r' \supseteq T_r$ and $T_v' \supseteq T_v$ are expansions which are both resilient. Then, $T' := T_0^{\mathrm{ac}} \cup T_r' \cup T_v'$ is resilient.
The same holds for henselian valued fields of residue characteristic 0. □

6. Open problems

In the last section we discuss some open problems, pose several questions and consider possible research directions around model-theoretic properties of valued difference fields.

6.1. Isometric case.

Another important class of valued difference fields is the class of valued fields with an *isometry*, where one requires that the induced automorphism σ_Γ on the value group Γ is the identity. The model theory of σ-henselian valued fields of residue characteristic 0 with an isometry is well understood, if one assumes in addition that there are *enough constants*, i.e. that every $\gamma \in \Gamma$ is of the form $\mathrm{val}(a)$ for some $a \in \mathrm{Fix}(\sigma)$.

By work of Bélair, Macintyre and Scanlon [BMS07] and then (in a slightly more general setting) Durhan and van den Dries [AvdD11], in this context one may eliminate quantifiers from the field sort $\mathbf{K}$ in the language with angular components and thus get an Ax-Kochen-Ershov principle, analogous to Fact 2.9.

Conjecture 6.1. *Let* $\mathcal{K} = (K, k, \Gamma, \sigma, \mathrm{val}, \mathrm{ac})$ *be a* σ*-henselian valued difference field of residue characteristic 0. Assume that* σ *is an isometry and that there are enough constants. Then* $\mathrm{Th}(\mathcal{K})$ *is* NTP_2 *(resilient, respectively) if and only if* $\mathrm{Th}(k, \overline{\sigma})$ *is* NTP_2 *(resilient, respectively).*

Note that our proof of the contractive case cannot be transposed to the isometric setting. This is mainly due to the fact that sets of finite total dimension are no longer analysable in the residue field.

One may ask the same question about preservation of NTP$_2$ (and resilience) in other contexts where an Ax-Kochen-Ershov principle holds, e.g. for valued difference fields in the 'multiplicative case', a common generalisation of the contractive and the isometric case which was studied by Pal [Pal10].

6.2. **Further model theoretic properties of** VFA_0**.**

Definition 6.2. A theory is called *strong* if there are no $(\varphi_i(x, y_i), \bar{a}_i, k_i)$ with $\bar{a}_i = (a_{ij})_{j\in\omega}$ and $k_i \in \omega$ such that:

- $\{\varphi_i(x, a_{ij})\}_{j\in\omega}$ is k_i-inconsistent, for all $i \in \omega$,
- $\{\varphi_i(x, a_{if(i)})\}_{i\in\omega}$ is consistent for every $f : \omega \to \omega$.

Strong theories were defined by Adler in [Adl07]. They form a subclass of NTP$_2$ theories which can be viewed as 'super NTP$_2$'. For more on strong theories and the related notion of *burden* see [Che12].

Question 6.3. Is VFA$_0$ strong?

The following remark implies that VFA$_0$ is not of finite burden, as in a simple theory burden of a type equals the supremum of the weights of its completions.

Remark 6.4.
1. Let T be a simple theory. Assume that in T there is a (type-)definable infinite field F and a (type-)definable F-vector space V of dimension $\geq n$. Then, there is a type $p(x) \vdash x \in V$ such that $w(p) \geq n$.
2. Every completion of ACFA has a 1-type of weight n, for any $n \geq 1$.

Proof. To prove (1), choose $v_1, \dots, v_n \in V$ which are F-linearly independent. Choose any non-algebraic type $q(x)$ such that $q(x) \vdash x \in F$. Let $\overline{b} = (b_1, \dots, b_n)$ be a sequence of independent realisations of q (over some model M containing the v_i's). Let $b := \sum_{i=1}^n b_i v_i$. Since $\overline{b}$ and b are interdefinable over M, we compute $w(\mathrm{tp}(b/M)) = w(\mathrm{tp}(\overline{b}/M)) = n\, w(q) \geq n$.

The second part follows, considering $F := \mathrm{Fix}(\sigma)$ and $V := K$. □

Some further model theoretic properties of VFA$_0$ are of interest, both for sets in the real sort and in M^{eq}:

Question 6.5.
1. Is VFA$_0$ extensible? I.e. is it true that for every small set A, every type $p(x) \in S(A)$ has a global extension which does not fork over A? Note that it is enough to check this property for 1-types.

(2) Is VFA_0 low? I.e. is it true that for every formula $\varphi(x, y)$ there is $k \in \omega$ such that for every indiscernible sequence $(a_i)_{i\in\omega}$, the set $\{\varphi(x, a_i)\}_{i\in\omega}$ is consistent if and only if it is k-consistent?

(3) Does VFA_0 eliminate $\exists^\infty$?

It seems tempting to try to develop a theory of *simple* domination in VFA_0 (parallel to stable domination from [HHM08]). Some elements of the theory of simple types in NTP_2 theories are developed in [Che12].

Question 6.6. Is it true in VFA_0 that a union of two stably embedded sets is stably embedded? Is it at least true for simple stably embedded sets?

6.3. **Ordered modules.** With a view on our main results, it would be interesting to know which (ω-increasing) ordered difference groups are NTP_2, or even NIP. We will put this issue in a larger context. Let R be an ordered ring. Recall that an *ordered R-module* is an ordered abelian group $\langle M, 0, +, <\rangle$ together with an action of R by endomorphisms which is compatible with the orderings, i.e. such that $r \cdot m > 0$ for all $r > 0$ from R and all $m > 0$ from M. We consider ordered R-modules in the language $\mathcal{L}_{R-mod,<} = \{0, +, <, \lambda_r, r \in R\}$, where λ_r is a unary function which is interpreted by the scalar multiplication by r.

Question 6.7. (1) Are all ordered R-modules NIP (for all ordered rings R)?

(2) More specifically, are all ω-increasing ordered difference groups NIP? (This corresponds to the case where $R = \mathbb{Z}[\sigma, \sigma^1]$, see Section 2.1.)

Recall that every module is stable (see e.g. [Hod93]), and that every ordered abelian group is NIP, by a result of Gurevich and Schmidt [GS84]. Therefore, one might suspect a positive answer even to the first question. It seems that the answer to this question is unknown.

Remark 6.8. Every ordered difference subgroup of $\mathbb{Q}(\sigma)$ which is divisible as an abelian group has an NIP theory. In particular, the ordered difference group $\mathbb{Q}[\sigma, \sigma^{-1}]$ is NIP.

Remark 6.8 is a consequence of the following general result.

Proposition 6.9. *Let R be an ordered ring which is a principal ideal domain. Assume the following conditions:*

(1) R is densely ordered;

(2) for every $0 \neq r \notin R^\times$, the ideal rR is dense and codense in R, and

(3) R/rR is infinite for every $r \notin R^\times$.

Let T be the theory of non-trivial ordered R-modules M such that for every $0 \neq r \notin R^\times$, the submodule rM is dense and codense in M. Then T is complete and eliminates quantifiers in the language $\mathcal{L}_{R-mod,<} \cup \{P_r, r \in R\}$, where $P_r(x) :\Leftrightarrow \exists y\, r \cdot y = x$. In particular, T is NIP.

Proof. Let $\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}_{R-mod,<} \cup \{P_r, r \in R\}$. We show quantifier elimination by a standard back-and-forth argument. Let M and N be two models of T, with N sufficiently saturated. Assume that $f : A \cong B$ is an $\mathcal{L}$-isomorphism between finitely generated substructures $A \subseteq M$ and $B \subseteq N$. Since f respects the divisibility conditions by assumption, it extends (even uniquely) to an $\mathcal{L}$-isomorphism $\tilde{f} : \tilde{A} \cong \tilde{B}$, where $\tilde{A}$ and $\tilde{B}$ are the respective divisible hulls of A and B inside M and N.

Now let $a \in M \setminus \tilde{A}$. As $Ra \cap \tilde{A} = (0)$, for arbitrary $\tilde{a} \in \tilde{A}$ and $r, s \in R$ one has

$$M \models P_s(ra + \tilde{a}) \;\Leftrightarrow\; M \models P_{rs}(a) \wedge P_s(\tilde{a}).$$

It is thus enough to find $b \in N$ which lies in the image under $\tilde{f}$ of the cut of a over $\tilde{A}$ and which satisfies $N \models P_r(b)$ iff $M \models P_r(a)$ for all $r \in R$. By the assumption on (co-)densitiy and saturation of N, this is always possible. This shows quantifier elimination. Now everything follows easily. □

References

[Adl07] Hans Adler. Strong theories, burden, and weight. *Preprint*, 2007.

[Adl08] Hans Adler. An introduction to theories without the independence property. *to appear in Archive Math. Logic*, 2008.

[AvdD11] Salih Azgin and Lou van den Dries. Elementary theory of valued fields with a valuation-preserving automorphism. *J. Inst. Math. Jussieu*, 10(1):1–35, 2011.

[Azg07] Salih Azgin. *Model theory of valued difference fields*. PhD thesis, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 2007.

[Azg10] Salih Azgin. Valued fields with contractive automorphism and Kaplansky fields. *J. Algebra*, 324(10):2757–2785, 2010.

[BMS07] Luc Bélair, Angus Macintyre, and Thomas Scanlon. Model theory of the Frobenius on the Witt vectors. *Amer. J. Math.*, 129(3):665–721, 2007.

[BYC12] Itaï Ben Yaacov and Artem Chernikov. An independence theorem for NTP_2 theories. *Submitted, arXiv:1207.0289v1*, 2012.

[CH99] Zoé Chatzidakis and Ehud Hrushovski. Model theory of difference fields. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 351(8):2997–3071, 1999.

[Che12] Artem Chernikov. Theories without the tree property of the second kind. 2012, arXiv:1204.0832v1 [math.LO].

[CK12] Artem Chernikov and Itay Kaplan. Forking and dividing in NTP_2 theories. *J. Symbolic Logic*, 77(1):1–20, 2012.

[Del81] Françoise Delon. Types sur $\mathbf{C}((X))$. In *Study Group on Stable Theories (Bruno Poizat), Second year: 1978/79 (French)*, pages Exp. No. 5, 29. Secrétariat Math., Paris, 1981.

[Gia11] Gabriel Giabicani. *Théorie de l'intersection en géométrie aux différences*. PhD thesis, École Polytechnique, Palaiseau, 2011.

[GS84] Yuri Gurevich and Peter H. Schmitt. The theory of ordered abelian groups does not have the independence property. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 284(1):171–182, 1984.

[HHM08] Deirdre Haskell, Ehud Hrushovski, and Dugald Macpherson. *Stable domination and independence in algebraically closed valued fields*, volume 30 of *Lecture Notes in Logic*. Association for Symbolic Logic, Chicago, IL, 2008.

[HK06] Ehud Hrushovski and David Kazhdan. Integration in valued fields. In *Algebraic geometry and number theory*, volume 253 of *Progr. Math.*, pages 261–405. Birkhäuser Boston, Boston, MA, 2006.

[HL11] Ehud Hrushovski and François Loeser. Non-archimedean tame topology and stably dominated types. *Preprint, arXiv:1009.0252v2*, 2011.

[Hod93] Wilfred Hodges. *Model theory.* Cambridge University Press, 1993.

[Hru01] Ehud Hrushovski. The Manin-Mumford conjecture and the model theory of difference fields. *Ann. Pure Appl. Logic*, 112(1):43–115, 2001.

[Hru02] Ehud Hrushovski. Valued fields with automorphisms. Manuscript, 2002.

[Hru04] Ehud Hrushovski. The elementary theory of the frobenius automorphisms. 2004, arXiv:0406514v1 [math.LO].

[Pal10] Koushik Pal. Multiplicative valued difference fields. 2010, arXiv:1011.1655v2 [math.LO].

[Pas89] Johan Pas. Uniform p-adic cell decomposition and local zeta functions. *J. Reine Angew. Math.*, 399:137–172, 1989.

[She80] Saharon Shelah. Simple unstable theories. *Ann. Math. Logic*, 19(3):177–203, 1980.

[She90] Saharon Shelah. *Classification theory and the number of nonisomorphic models*, volume 92 of *Studies in Logic and the Foundations of Mathematics*. North-Holland Publishing Co., Amsterdam, second edition, 1990.

[She09] Saharon Shelah. Strongly dependent theories. 2009, arXiv:math/0504197v4 [math.LO].
[Wag00] Frank O. Wagner. *Simple theories*, volume 503 of *Mathematics and its Applications*. Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht, 2000.

Université Lyon 1, Institut Camille Jordan (UMR 5208 du CNRS), 43 Boulevard du 11 Novovembre 1918, 69622 Villeurbanne Cedex, France
E-mail address: `art.chernikov@gmail.com`

Institut de Mathématiques de Jussieu (UMR 7586 du CNRS), Université Paris Diderot Paris 7, UFR de Mathématiques - case 7012, 75205 Paris Cedex 13, France, and
École Normale Supérieure, Département de mathématiques et applications, 45 rue d'Ulm, 75230 Paris Cedex 05, France (UMR 8553 du CNRS).
E-mail address: `hils@math.univ-paris-diderot.fr`